

**Remarks**

Applicant has read and considered the Office Action dated May 2, 2003, and the references cited therein. Claim 1 has been amended.

In the Action, claims 1-19, 22-25 and 71-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. in view of Iddan et al. Claim 1 has now been amended to recite a capsule comprising a stereoscopic sensor assembly. Applicant asserts that this is neither shown nor suggested by any of the prior art. As shown in Figure 8, Okada has two separate lens units 133 and 21. However, neither of these is stereoscopic. Moreover, the lens 133 is mounted in a unit that is not part of any type of capsule. Okada teaches two lenses that are mounted apart with each sensor only having a single lens that is not stereoscopic. Moreover, even when combined with Iddan, which also lacks the stereoscopic sensor assembly in the capsule, the present invention is neither shown nor suggested. Neither of the references either alone or in combination teach the presently recited invention. Applicant asserts that the present invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. and Iddan et al., and further in view of Adelson. As discussed above, Applicant asserts that the present invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Applicant asserts that the combination of Okada et al., Iddan et al. and Adelson neither teaches nor suggests the invention as recited in claim 1. Applicant asserts that claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over the combination.

Claims 27-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. and Iddan et al, in view of Watannabe. As discussed above, Applicant asserts that the present invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Applicant asserts that the combination of Okada et al., Iddan et al. and Watannabe neither teaches nor suggests the invention as recited in claim 1. As indicated above, Applicant asserts that claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over the combination.

Claims 40-50 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al., Iddan et al, in view of Street. As discussed above, Applicant asserts that the present invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Applicant asserts that the combination of Okada et al., Iddan et al. and Street neither teaches nor suggests the invention as recited in claim 1. Applicant asserts that claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over the combination.

Claims 20-21, 51 and 53-70 were allowed over the prior art. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowability of these claims.

A speedy and favorable action on the merits is hereby solicited. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview may be helpful in this matter, please contact Applicant's Representative at (612) 336-4728.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

4/21/04

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Gregory A. Sebald  
Reg. No. 33,280  
GAS/km